



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## BRIEF MENTION.

The volume on *Aelian* is not the least interesting part of SCHMID's *Atticismus*, the first volume of which was noticed in this Journal, IX 98. Every one calls Aelian a scribbler, and yet every one is glad to use Aelian's material, and we should all miss his contributions to the *chronique scandaleuse* of both man and beast. Cobet is perfectly safe in sneering at his Atticism (see A. J. P. V 537, VI 517), and yet the unprejudiced modern must admit that he is not a bad story-teller. But many of the post-classic people are good story-tellers, perhaps because they have the bad taste to be so much like us, and it is precisely to this faculty of story-telling that Schmid, a pupil of Rohde's, has called attention in this volume, and the interest of the book lies in his attempt to prove that Aelian is an important representative, or rather successor, of those who introduced the *fabula Milesia* of the people into literature. It is Aelian and those whom he follows that anticipated the *contes drolatiques* and the *picaresco* romances that we associate with Decameron and Heptameron, with Mendoza and Quevedo. The piebald style of Aelian, over which Cobet makes so merry, is, according to Schmid, the piebald style of the *fabula Milesia* tempered by rhetorical methods, and its simplicity is an artificial simplicity that is made to carry a real *ποικιλία*. Of this manufactured simplicity in narrative the Greek rhetoricians have much to say, notably Aristides, in his treatise *περὶ ἀφελούης λόγου*, a treatise which, in my judgment, is too much neglected and which the student of Xenophon cannot afford to neglect, and from Aristides we can learn how Aelian must have gone to work in order to learn the story-teller's art. According to Schmid's analysis, Herodotos, whose influence on the literature of the period it would be hard to overestimate, furnished the model of simplicity; Xenophon, the lunar rainbow of Herodotos, furnished the Attic dialect; Plato supplied the conversational turns; the *fabula Milesia* the improprieties, and the firm of Stoic and Cynic the moralizing which illuminates the gruel 'thick and slab' of Aelian's style. In Cobet's characterization of Aelian stress is laid on his Latinisms (comp. A. J. P. XIV 106), but on this point Schmid touches only here and there. In a book crowded with infinite details it would be very easy to find occasional slips, but the work has its value, as well as its interest, for students of the Greek of every period, and it is evident that Schmid is getting a firmer hold of his subject as he goes on, and one could only wish that the less trodden parts of pure Attic literature had received as much attention as Schmid has bestowed on Aelian. But while one is willing to grant that Schmid has made respectable progress in a most difficult undertaking, still it must be said that he betrays the danger of attacking any sphere of post-classic Greek without the mastery of what lies before. So in the second volume of his *Atticismus* (p. 60) Schmid makes the suggestion that the Alabandian rhetoricians, Hierokles and Menekles, famous men in Cicero's boyhood (Brutus 95, 325), may have given

vogue to the *σολοικισμὸς Ἀλαβανδιακός*, i. e. the solecistic use of *μή* for *οὐ* (A. J. P. I 46). But instead of following this up, he contents himself with telling us that Arrian was not guiltless in this respect. As if any one expected anything else of Arrian! The first lines of the *Anabasis* show that. Much more to the point would have been the study of the writers immediately preceding Christ, who might be supposed to have felt the Alabandian wave. And sure enough, Diodorus, who belongs to that period, gives us all the instances one can reasonably ask. Not to waste time, I cite from two books only, XII and XIII, without any pretence of having exhausted the examples even in these two: XII 49 (vol. II, p. 142, 31, Teubner ed.), 56 (p. 149, 17), 83 (p. 178, 5); XIII 11 (p. 190, 17), 17 (p. 196, 12), 59 (p. 243, 16), 61 (p. 246, 22), 78 (p. 265, 11), 99 (p. 291, 4), 100 (p. 292, 29), 106 (p. 298, 24).

---

Any one at all familiar with the run of post-classical Greek must have been surprised at the confident tone with which it has been stated that the dual practically died the death in the last quarter of the fourth century B. C. The very existence of the late form *δνεῖν* should have checked that statement. It is true that in a sense the dual was dead, but it would be a hard question to determine how much of late Greek is true survival, how much is literary ghost, and if the late dual is a mere sham, or a mere *schemen*, so is much else that is allowed to have a real life in the very unreal world of Hellenistic literature. Indeed, as to the classic authors themselves, there is good reason to suspect a certain artificiality about the use, especially in Plato, whose employment of the dual stands in striking contrast to that of Aristophanes, as Roeper pointed out long ago; and the large use of the verbal forms in the later stage of the Attic orators is not altogether canny. The seat of the dual should be in the substantive, and not in the adjective, where Plato puts it, nor in the verb. It is this evidence of artificiality in the good period that adds a special interest to Dr. HERMANN SCHMIDT's contribution to the *Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen*, which bears the title *De duali graecorum et emoriente et reviviscente* (Breslau, Wilhelm Koebner, 1893). After a brief introduction, in which he sums up the results of his predecessors, Dr. Schmidt proceeds to his proper task, the exhibition of dual forms in writers of the post-classic period, from Aristotle to Dion Chrysostomos, the latter of whom is wrongly credited by Christ (Müller's Hdb. VII<sup>2</sup>, p. 597) with having revived a form which was the common property of all the later Atticists (Schmid, *Atticismus*, I 87; see also III 46). Not to go into details, the tables show a progressive decline of the dual from Aristotle to Diodoros, and a gradual rise from Dionysios of Halikarnasos on. The range of words is limited. Conspicuous are *δνοῖν*, *ἀμφοῖν*, *χεροῖν*, *ποδοῖν*. The nom.-acc. forms *ὀφθαλμῷ*, *χεῖρι*, *πόδε* are not resurrected until the time of Dionysios. Of dual verb-forms there is merely a trace, so that decay of the dual is more organic, if one dare say so, than in the classic times.

---

In the *Prolegomena* to the first volume of his critical edition of *Dion Chrysostomos* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1893) VON ARNIM says: *Pauci admodum ad hunc*

scriptorem accedere [solent], dignum imprimis qui ab omnibus legatur. Of course, one always expects an editor to magnify his author. At all events, very few treat those, whom they think it worth while to edit, so scurvily as Naber has treated poor Fronto, for which warm-hearted old African I actually conceived a certain affection in consequence of Naber's unkindness.

τοῖς ἡσσοσιν γὰρ πᾶς τις ἐννοίας φέρει.

But all editorial predilection apart, it is surprising how little has been done for or with Dion, and I never return to him without wondering that in the dearth of subjects for dissertations, so few have looked into the mass of interesting problems in art, literature, philosophy and morals suggested by his discourses. If the average Grecian knows the pretty 'Dorfgeschichte' (Εὐβοϊκός), to which Otto Jahn called especial attention, the Φιλοκτήτης, which forces itself on the students of Sophokles, and the 'Ὀλυμπικός ἢ περὶ τῆς πρώτης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐννοίας, made conspicuous by Geel's special edition—it is as much. Something has been done of late for Dion's style by Schmid in the first volume of his Atticismus, but no systematic attempt has been made to disentangle from the rhetorical web the threads of literary tradition and historical fact. Doubtless the work will yet be done, and whoever comes to it will have a much surer foundation than heretofore in von Arnim's text, which is based on Emperius' edition, but supported by a better knowledge of the contents of the leading MSS and of their affinities.

---

The invaluable critical edition of *Aischylos* by WECKLEIN (A. J. P. V 543) has received in the current year two *Auctaria* (Berlin, Calvary). The *Auctarium* to the First Part contains the *Fragments*, the *Auctarium* to the Second Part the *Appendix propagata*. This *Appendix propagata*, with true Teutonic indifference to the feelings of people who cannot use books unless they are bound, begins at p. 289, swallows up all the matter published in pp. 289-315 of the Second Part, and undertakes to record in addition all the conjectures given to the world from 1885, the date of the Second Part, down to Verrall's Choëphori (1893). Such an apparatus is a great boon to the student of Aischylos. Let us hope that it will not turn too many students into 'critical' editors.